

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-21 and 24-34 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 25 are amended. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled. No new claim is added. Applicants respectfully request for allowance of each of pending claims.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-21, and 24-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fernandez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103, hereinafter referred to as “Fernandez”).

The claim 1 has been amended for further distinction over the cited reference. As amended, claim 1 recites in part:

“A mobile digital security system comprising: a digital video recorder disposed in each of at least one mobile unit and operable to generate a digital video/data signal, wherein each digital video recorder includes a wireless interface for encapsulating and transmitting the digital video/date signal;” (emphasis added).

Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, for example, paragraphs [014] and [015] provide: “Each digital video recorder may include a network interface, such as the IEEE 802.11b interface, for communicating the digital video/data to the archiving server” and “The 802.11b standard specifies a wireless local area network...” (Emphases added).

Fernandez fails to disclose or suggest the above-identified limitations of claim 1 as amended. The Examiner asserts that the claimed “digital video recorder” is disclosed in col. 8, lines 10-20 of Fernandez (Office action, page 5). However, col. 8, lines 10-20 of Fernandez merely describes a “digital video disk (DVD).” However, the “digital video disk

(DVD)” should be distinguished from the claimed “digital video recorder” because the former is merely a memory device. Accordingly, the “digital video disk (DVD)” disclosed in Fernandez is not comparable to the “digital video recorder” recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Fernandez does not disclose or suggest a “digital video recorder including a wireless interface for encapsulating and transmitting the digital video/date signal” as recited in the amended claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 further recites in part: “at least one central data process unit for detecting new video data in each digital video recorder by checking each digital video recorder’s recording history.”

Support for the above amendment is found in Fig. 1 and paragraph [028] of the present application. Paragraph [028] describes: “Central data process 190 may include functionality to initiate a remote retrieve function to detect the presence of new video data in each digital video recorder 10 by, for example, checking each digital video recorder’s 110 recording history.”

However, nowhere in Fernandez discloses or suggests the above-recited element of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Fernandez does not anticipate claim 1. As amended, claim 25 recite similar limitations as claim 1 and for the same reasons discussed above, claim 25 is also patentable over Fernandez under section 102. Accordingly, all dependent claims depending from either claim 1 or 25 are patentable over Fernandez under section 102(b) as well.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez in view of Lewellen (US 2004/0008255) and Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 7,100,190).

The Examiner relied on Lewellen and Johnson to show a wireless WLAN using the 802.11b standard and the surveillance system used by law enforcement, respectively. As argued above, claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and include all the limitations recited in claim 1 as amended and additional limitations. Accordingly, Fernandez, Lewellen, and Johnson, considered alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 3 or 5. As such, claims 3 and 5 are patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore, respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Should the Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Howard Chen, Esq., Attorney for  
Applicants, Registration No. 46,615

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates & Ellis LLP  
55 Second Street, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 882-8200  
Facsimile: (415) 882-8220  
JHL